

Appl. No. 09/784,654  
Appl filing Feb 15, 2001  
Reply to Office action of Oct. 12, 2004

publication date of US 6,362,778 is March 26, 2002, also after the filing date of the pending application.

Otto (US 5,982,808) teaches a panic button in column 6, lines 12-34, however the operation of pressing the panic button multiple times is not obvious, and is separate from the sequence of key presses. In particular '808 teaches that the panic mode can be entered by pressing "...a panic button..." (Col. 6, Line 23) and "...through the entry of a particular key sequence on a keyboard..." (Col. 6, Lines 25 - 26). These passages clearly indicate that there is a panic button and a keyboard, where the sequence of keys applies to the keyboard and not to the panic button. The Otto patent does not disclose pressing the panic button more than once, nor does it disclose that pressing a sequence of keys on the keyboard is performed for the purposes of preventing false alarms. Otto does not teach implicitly or explicitly that the panic button be depressed "...twice in rapid sequence..." as required in claim 1 of the pending application. Further the examiner has not shown how one of ordinary skill in the art would use the Otto patent with a single panic button and depressing a sequence of keys on a keyboard, would motivate to press the single panic button twice in rapid succession. Otto teaches away from depressing the single panic button twice by providing a keyboard, wherein the keyboard allows entry of multiple commands and function including panic.

Appl. No. 09/784,654  
Appl filing Feb 15, 2001  
Reply to Office action of Oct. 12, 2004

Applicant doesn't understand how the Examiner could determine in light of his foregoing remarks, how Neher is prior art or how Otto discloses depressing the panic button twice in rapid sequence

In view of the numerous remarks made in reference to the validity of the identified patents and in the operation of the claimed devices of Neher and Otto, how the examiner using ordinary skills in the art would combine them. The applicant cannot understand how the cited references can fairly be read to support the Section 103(a) rejection of Claim 1.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn and the Application be sent to allowance.

Respectfully submitted:

---

Kirk A. Buhler, Reg. No.52,670  
1101 California Ave, Suite 100  
Corona, CA 92881  
(909) 515-6447  
Agent for Applicant